



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

WPA  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/835,821	04/17/2001	Jari Eikkula	060258-0280240	5540
909	7590	02/21/2008	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP			MAIS, MARK A	
P.O. BOX 10500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MCLEAN, VA 22102			2619	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/21/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/835,821	EIKKULA, JARI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mark A. Mais	2619

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 15-18,24-28,30-32,35,36 and 38-43 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4,7,8,11-14,21,22,29,33,34,37 and 44-51 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 5,6,9,10,19,20 and 23 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01 OCT 2007.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) was filed on October 1, 2007. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.97. According, the examiner considered the IDS.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-4, 7-8, 13, 21, 22, 29, 33, 34, and 44-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yoakum et al. (USP 6,735,621).

4. With regard to claims 1 and 13, Yoakum et al. discloses a method *comprising*:

adding *non-IP telephony signaling protocol* service reference information to an IP telephony signaling message [**adds SS7 signaling into SIP (Abstract; SS7 is a non-IP signaling protocol); the IP Network 108 uses SIP, and it is inherent that a network using SIP must be able to add/separate/use the SS7 service reference information delivered in the SIP messages**]

and sending an IP telephony signaling protocol message to a network node [**An SIP message is sent from the IP Network 108 to the SCG 1, see Abstract**].

5. With regard to claim 2, Yoakum et al. discloses that the IP telephony signaling protocol message is a message initiating a session [**SIP INVITE, col. 2, lines 14-24**].

6. With regard to claim 3, Yoakum et al. discloses routing a call to the network node via an entry point [**Fig. 1, Number Server 107 is an entry point between Network 1 and the IP Network, col. 4, lines 60-63**] and performing said adding in the entry point [**the number server 107 can proxy messages to other SIP nodes and receives/converts all called party addresses to numerical values prior to sending them back to Network 1, col. 5, lines 6-12**].

7. With regard to claim 4, Yoakum et al. discloses that the address of the entry point is added as service reference information to the IP telephony signaling protocol message [**the called number (address) is replaced with the new address based on the proxy results for the TCAP-to-SIP and SIP-to-TCAP replacements, col. 5, lines 3-12**].

8. With regard to claim 7, Yoakum et al. discloses that the IP telephony signaling protocol message is a response message acknowledging a message invoking a session **[upon call data being received at the entry point, an SIP INVITE message is encoded and then sent back, col. 6, lines 29-55]**.
9. With regard to claim 8, Yoakum et al. discloses receiving an IP telephony signaling protocol message in a network node serving a called subscriber and adding at least the address of the network node serving a called subscriber as service reference information to the response message **[the called number (address) is replaced with the new address based on the proxy results for the TCAP-to-SIP and SIP-to-TCAP replacements, col. 5, lines 3-12]**.
10. With regard to claim 21, Yoakum et al. discloses a user equipment **[Fig. 1, interpreted as user equipment in IP Network 108]**, a first network node **[Fig. 1, IP Network 108]**, a second network node **[Fig. 1, Service Control Gateway (SCG 1), col. 2, lines 64-66]**  
wherein  
the first network node **[Fig. 1, IP Network 108]** is arranged to add *non-IP telephony signaling protocol* service reference information relating to a call made to the user equipment to an IP telephony signaling protocol **[adds SS7 signaling into SIP (Abstract; SS7 is a non-IP signaling protocol); the IP Network 108 uses SIP, and it is inherent that a network using**

**SIP must be able to add/separate/use the SS7 service reference information delivered in the SIP messages**

message to the second network node [Fig. 1, Service Control Gateway (SCG 1), col. 2, lines 64-66]; and

the second network node is arranged to separate the service reference information from the IP telephony signaling protocol message [Fig. 1, SCG 101 stores and adds information in TCAP messages into SIP messages from Network 1, col. 3, lines 16-25; and vice-versa when it receives messages bound for Network 1 from the IP Network, col. 2, lines 36-40].

11. With regard to claim 22, Yoakum et al. discloses that the address of the first node is added as a service reference information to the IP telephony signaling protocol message [Fig. 1, SCG 101 stores and adds information in TCAP messages into SIP messages from Network 1, col. 3, lines 16-25; and vice-versa when it receives messages bound for Network 1 from the IP Network, col. 2, lines 36-40; moreover, this is a function performed in SIP when creating SIP messages; e.g. SIP INVITE, col. 2, lines 14-24].

12. With regard to claim 29, Yoakum et al. discloses a user equipment [Fig. 1, interpreted as user equipment in IP Network 108], a first network node [Fig. 1, IP Network 108], a second network node [Fig. 1, Service Control Gateway (SCG 1), col. 2, lines 64-66]

wherein the first network node [Fig. 1, IP Network 108] is arranged to add first service reference information relating to a call made to the user equipment to an IP telephony signaling

protocol initiating a session [**the IP Network 108 uses SIP, and it is inherent that the IP network must be able to add/separate/use the service reference information delivered in the SIP messages; this function is performed in SIP when creating SIP INVITE; e.g. SIP INVITE, col. 2, lines 14-24**], to send the IP telephony signaling protocol message initiating a message to the second network node [**Fig. 1, the SIP message is sent from the IP network to Network 1 via SCG 1**];

to receive a response message acknowledging the IP telephony signaling protocol message initiating a session and to separate second service reference information relating to the call from the SIP response message [**adds SS7 signaling into SIP (Abstract; SS7 is a non-IP signaling protocol); the IP Network 108 uses SIP, and it is inherent that a network using SIP must be able to add/separate/use the SS7 service reference information delivered in the SIP messages**]; and

**the second network node [Fig. 1, Service Control Gateway (SCG 1), col. 2, lines 64-66]; is arranged to separate the first service reference information from the IP telephony signaling protocol message initiating a session and to add the second reference information to the response message and to send the response message to the first network node [Fig. 1, SCG 101 stores and adds information in TCAP messages into SIP messages from Network 1, col. 3, lines 16-25; and vice-versa when it receives messages bound for Network 1 from the IP Network, col. 2, lines 36-40; moreover, this is a function performed in SIP when creating SIP messages; e.g. SIP INVITE, col. 2, lines 14-24; when call data is received at the entry point, an SIP INVITE message is encoded and then sent back, col. 6, lines 29-55; thus, there is a back and forth of adding addresses and separating reference information between the**

**two network nodes, e.g., the called number (address) is replaced with the new address based on the proxy results for the TCAP-to-SIP and SIP-to-TCAP replacements, col. 5, lines 3-12] wherein the first service reference information is non-IP telephony signaling protocol service information [see above].**

13. With regard to claims 33 and 34, Yoakum et al. discloses a network node [Fig. 1, IP Network 108] in a communications system providing IP telephony, wherein the network node comprises means for adding/separating *non-IP telephony signaling protocol* service reference information to an IP telephony signaling message [**adds SS7 signaling into SIP (Abstract; SS7 is a non-IP signaling protocol); the IP Network 108 uses SIP, and it is inherent that a network using SIP must be able to add/separate/use the SS7 service reference information delivered in the SIP messages**].

14. With regard to claims 44-45 and 48-49, Yoakum et al. discloses a processor configured to add/separate non-IP telephony signaling protocol service reference information to an IP telephony signaling protocol message [**adds SS7 signaling into SIP (Abstract; SS7 is a non-IP signaling protocol); the IP Network 108 uses SIP, and it is inherent that a network using SIP must be able to add/separate/use the SS7 service reference information delivered in the SIP messages; it is inherent that a processor and/or computer program performs this function**].

15. With regard to claims 46-47 and 50-51, Yoakum et al. discloses a processor configured to generate/separate a charging identifier to be used in billing as charging correlation information from an SIP message [**Yoakum et al. discloses Intelligent Network Application Protocol (INAP) which provides the non-IP billing/charging identifier for inter-network compatibility between SS7 and SIP, col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line 5**].

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 11, 12, 14, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoakum et al.

18. With regard to claims 11, 12, and 14, Yoakum et al. discloses adding SS7 signaling into SIP [**Abstract; SS7 is a non-IP signaling protocol**]. The IP Network 108 uses SIP, and it is inherent that a network using SIP must be able to add/separate/use the SS7 service reference information delivered in the SIP messages. Yoakum et al. does not specifically disclose that the telephony signaling protocol is OSA, Parlay API, or H.323. Such signaling protocols are well known to those of ordinary skill in the art. Moreover, adding service reference information to

each of these well-known telephony standards is the *intent* of these protocols. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have added service reference information to not only SIP—but to OSA, Parlay API, or H.323—because service protocols (such as SIP) provide call control that is used to establish, modify, and terminate multimedia sessions (calls) and provide call setup, modification, and termination functions [col. 2, lines 11-16].

19. With regard to claim 37, Yoakum et al. does not specifically disclose that the network node comprises a call state control function. However, such functionality is well known in the art. SIP provides call control functionalities used to establish, modify, and terminate multimedia sessions (calls) and provide call setup, modification, and termination functions [col. 2, lines 11-16]. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided for a network node with call control state functionalities because gateways between networks provide the means to call control such as set-up and teardown (as well as billing).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

20. Claims 15-18, 24-28, 30-32, 35, 36, and 38-43 are allowed.

21. Claims 5, 6, 9, 10, 19, 20, and 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

22. Applicant's arguments filed January 23, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

23. With respect to claim 1, Applicant argues that Yoakum et al. fails to disclose adding non-IP telephony signaling protocol service reference information to an IP signaling protocol message (SIP) **[Applicant's Request for Reconsideration dated January 23, 2008, page 16, paragraph 2]**. With respect to claims 21, 29, 33, 34, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, and 49, Applicant makes a similar argument **[Applicant's Request for Reconsideration dated January 23, 2008, page 17, paragraph 3 to page 19, paragraph 3]**. Specifically, Applicant states that Yoakum et al. translates SS7 signaling into SIP messages **[Applicant's Request for Reconsideration dated January 23, 2008, page 16, paragraph 2]**. Moreover, Applicant argues that Yoakum et al. fails to add ("as is" is interpreted as raw) information in a non-IP protocol format to a message that is in an IP protocol format (interpreted by the examiner as encapsulated) and further argues, apparently, that the information added in a non-IP format to the IP protocol format is retained as (raw) information within the non-IP format (which is apparently encapsulated within the IP

protocol format) [Applicant's Request for Reconsideration dated January 23, 2008, page 16, paragraphs 3-4]. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

24. As noted for the rejection of claim 1, for example, Yoakum et al. discloses adding SS7 signaling into SIP [Abstract; SS7 is a non-IP signaling protocol]. The IP Network 108 uses SIP, and it is inherent that a network using SIP must be able to add/separate/use the SS7 service reference information delivered in the SIP messages.

25. If Applicant is arguing that the (raw) information added in a non-IP protocol format cannot be translated, the examiner does not see such a limitation in the claims. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the (raw) information added in a non-IP protocol format cannot be translated) are not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

26. If Applicant is arguing that the (raw) information added in a non-IP protocol format must be encapsulated within the IP protocol format, the examiner does not see such a limitation in the claims. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the (raw) information added in a non-IP protocol format must be encapsulated within the IP protocol format) are not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the

specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

27. In addition, Applicant states that the current invention allows CAMEL-related information to be transmitted in the IP telephony signaling protocol [Applicant's Request for Reconsideration dated January 23, 2008, page 15, paragraphs 1-3]. The examiner respectfully agrees and notes the allowance of claims 15-18, 24-28, 30-32, 35, 36, and 38-43.

28. With respect to claims 46, 47, 50, and 51, Applicant states that Yoakum et al. discloses the use of INAP to extend the capabilities of SS7 but argues, apparently, that SS7 fails to disclose non-IP billing charging identifier for inter-network compatibility between SS7 and SIP [Applicant's Request for Reconsideration dated January 23, 2008, page 15, paragraphs 1-3]. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

29. As noted in the rejections of claims 46, 47, 50 and 51, Yoakum et al. discloses an Intelligent Network Application Protocol (INAP) which provides the non-IP billing/charging identifier for inter-network compatibility between SS7 and SIP [col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line 5]. INAP merely extends the SS7 capabilities--it does not replace or supplant those capabilities. INAP specifically uses the SS7 signaling stack. Accordingly, the SS7 capabilities (e.g., SS7 service reference information already discussed in the rejection of claim 1) *necessarily* includes billing/charging identifiers.

30. With respect to claims 11, 12, 14 and 37, Applicant states that the examiner has misunderstood the novel and non-obvious aspects of Applicant's invention—specifically, that with respect to claims 1 and 33, Yoakum et al. fails to disclose adding non-IP telephony signaling protocol service reference information to an IP telephony signaling protocol [Applicant's Request for Reconsideration dated January 23, 2008, page 21, paragraphs 1-5; page 22, paragraphs 1-2]. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

31. First, as noted in the rejection of claims 11, 12, and 14, Yoakum et al. discloses adding SS7 signaling into SIP [Abstract; SS7 is a non-IP signaling protocol]. The IP Network 108 uses SIP, and it is inherent that a network using SIP must be able to add/separate/use the SS7 service reference information delivered in the SIP messages. Such signaling protocols are well known to those of ordinary skill in the art. Moreover, adding service reference information to each of these well-known telephony standards is the *intent* of these protocols. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have added service reference information to not only SIP—but to OSA, Parlay API, or H.323—because service protocols (such as SIP) provide call control that is used to establish, modify, and terminate multimedia sessions (calls) and provide call setup, modification, and termination functions [col. 2, lines 11-16].

32. Second, as noted in the rejection of claim 37, Yoakum et al. does not specifically disclose that the network node comprises a call state control function. However, such functionality is well known in the art. SIP provides call control functionalities used to establish, modify, and

terminate multimedia sessions (calls) and provide call setup, modification, and termination functions [col. 2, lines 11-16]. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided for a network node with call control state functionalities because gateways between networks provide the means to call control such as set-up and teardown (as well as billing).

33. Third, as noted in the Response to Arguments with respect to claims 1 and 33 above, the examiner respectfully incorporates those arguments with respect to claims 11, 12, 14, and 37.

34. With respect to claims 11, 12, 14, and 37, Applicant asserts that well known features cannot be interpreted from an examiner's general common knowledge or common sense [Applicant's Request for Reconsideration dated January 23, 2008, page 22, paragraph 3 to page 23, paragraph 4; citing *In re Zurko* and *In re Sang Su Lee*]. Applicant argues, apparently, that the examiner has only made an obviousness rejection based on reasoning gleaned from general common knowledge and common sense, which do not substitute for the proper motivation to provide the solution claimed by the applicant [Applicant's Request for Reconsideration dated January 23, 2008, page 23, paragraph 4]. Applicant argues that such reasoning by the examiner is based on impermissible hindsight [Applicant's Request for Reconsideration dated January 23, 2008, page 23, paragraph 3]. Moreover, Applicant argues, apparently, that the examiner must provide the proper motivation (other than the intent of various signaling protocols other than SIP or SS7) to modify Yoakum et al. to include, apparently, any other telephony signaling protocol other than SIP or SS7 [Applicant's Request for Reconsideration dated

**January 23, 2008, page 23, paragraph 5].** Finally, Applicant seems to argue that Yoakum et al. must specifically disclose, teach, or suggest a combination with another (patent) reference in order to provide the proper requisite motivation for combining such references [Applicant's Request for Reconsideration dated January 23, 2008, page 23, paragraph 5]. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

35. First, it is important to note that the examiner has not made a rejection based on the examiner's general common knowledge or based on common sense. The examiner's reasoning has been made explicit [see rejections above].

36. Second, In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

37. Third, as noted in the previous Response to Arguments dated August 23, 2007, the examiner has made a reasonable rejection based on the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification. The examiner asserts that such analysis has been made explicit [see rejection above]. Voice over IP (VoIP) networks all must use some type of signaling. But, not all VoIP

networks use the *same* signaling. To achieve translations between different VoIP networks, conversion (proxy) gateways often perform translations between different signaling protocols such as H.323/H.450, SIP, MAGACO, etc.—specifically, there are several examples of other VoIP signaling protocol translations [e.g., **Yoakum et al. performs TCAP-to-SIP translations; Li et al. (USP 6,961,332) performs ISDN-to-H323 translations, and both Ma et al.’s (USPs 6,868,090 and 7,136, 373) perform TCAP-to-H.323/H.450 translations**]. Moreover, there are only a finite number of telephony signaling protocols (IP and non-IP) with which a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his technical grasp to add service reference information from these protocols to SIP messages. If this leads to anticipated success, it is likely the product is not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense [**KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. (KSR) , 82 USPQ2d 1385 (CAFC 2007)**].

38. Fourth, **KSR** has foreclosed the issue of explicit disclosure within a reference(s) to provide the motivation to combine such a reference with other references as well an explicit rationale(s) for making obvious changes to the prior art.

### ***Conclusion***

39. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

40. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

41. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- (a) Yoakum et al. (USP 7,333,505), Transaction management for interworking between disparate networks.
- (b) Pershan (USP 7,277,421), Telephone call processing using SIP and/or ENUM.
- (c) O'Neill et al. (USP 7,243,162), Processing network communication control messages.

42. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark A. Mais whose telephone number is 572-272-3138. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 5am-4pm.

43. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing F. Chan can be reached on 571-272-7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

44. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MAM  
February 1, 2008

  
2/15/08  
WING CHAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER